



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 09/642,227 | 08/21/2000 | Yuji Shimizu | 250419US2X | 7672 |
| 22850 | 7590 | 05/16/2008 | | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | EXAMINER PORTER, RACHEL L | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3626 | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 05/16/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 09/642,227 | Applicant(s) SHIMIZU, YUJI | |
| | Examiner RACHEL L. PORTER | Art Unit 3626 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) RACHEL L. PORTER. (3)_____.

(2) Kurt Burger, Reg. No. 51,461. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 06 May 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: claims 30-31,55, in particular.

Identification of prior art discussed: Abelow, Murcko.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant explained that the Abelow reference was distinct from the Applicant's invention in that opinion information is gathered from the customer prior to the manufacture of and use of a product in applicant's invention. Applicant also explained that the recited "trial product" recited in claim 31 is not actually manufactured. Examiner will reconsider art rejection in light of the newly submitted amendments from 4/29/08.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Rachel L. Porter/
Examiner, Art Unit 3626

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required